

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 19-32 are pending. Of those claims, claims 1, 19 and 28 remain independent.

By the Amendment herewith, Applicant clarifies claims 1 and 30 to address the Examiner's informalities objection set forth at page 2 of the outstanding final Office Action. Accordingly, the objection should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Applicant also further clarifies claims 1-9, 19-21 and 26-32. It is respectfully noted that the amendments made herein are not made for reasons related to patentability and the full range of equivalents should remain intact.

The specification also is amended to delete a reference section. Claim numbering referenced in the specification also is replaced with the text of the original claims.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter and consider this Amendment, which is believed to place the application in condition for immediate allowance.

Regarding the rejections based upon art, claims 1-9, 19-26 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa (US Patent 6,549,650) in view of Inaba (US 5,778,268). Lastly, dependent claim 27 is rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa in view of Inaba and Orimoto (US Patent 7,102,685).

The foregoing rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

The Examiner acknowledges that Ishikawa does not disclose "altering mutual distance between the camera units is configured to cause turning of the camera units relative to each other, if the mutual position of the camera units do not correspond to the determined imaging mode" (Action, page 4). The Examiner refers to Inaba and asserts that Inaba would teach this feature.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's analysis.

Inaba discloses a stereo camera providing automatic adjusting of distance between optical axes as well as manual adjusting (Abstract).

In Inaba, the distance between optical axes of imaging lenses 4R and 4L is adjusted. The only movement that is disclosed is sideways movement of the lenses (see, e.g., Figures 3 and 6). Turning of the lenses is not disclosed or suggested and, more particularly, turning of the cameras, is not disclosed or suggested in Inaba.

Altering the distance between the lenses may change the optical path through the imaging system of Ibana. That is, altering the distance between the lenses may change characteristics of the image system, but no turning of the cameras is performed.

According to embodiments of Applicant's invention as set forth in the independent claims, altering the distance between the cameras causes turning of the cameras. Examples of turning of the cameras are shown, for example, in Figures 3, 4 and 11 of the subject application.

Additionally, the purpose of moving the lenses in Ibana is to provide parallel correction for stereo image (col. 1, line 32 – col. 2, line 14).

In contrast, according to Applicant's independent claims, mutual position of the cameras is adjusted to correspond to a determined imaging mode. Different imaging modes are, for example, 3D imaging, high resolution imaging and panorama imaging (page 4, line 26 - page 5, line 9 of the subject specification).

Applicant respectfully asserts that no combination of Ishikawa and Ibana would result in turning of the cameras in the way recited in Applicant's independent claims. All that may be achieved with the combination of Ishikawa and Ibana (the combination of which is not admitted to be proper by Applicant) is including movement of camera lenses in Ishikawa so that turning the cameras in Ishikawa would be replaced by sideways movement of the lenses inside the camera modules. No turning of cameras caused by altering the distance between the cameras would have been achieved.

At least for the above reasons, the combined teachings of Ishikawa and Inaba would not have lead to the subject matter recited in Applicant's independent claims.

Nor is there any reason to combine and modify the teachings of the cited references in an attempt to arrive at the subject matter recited in these independent claims.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 19 and 28 are patentable. Accordingly, all remaining dependent claims also are patentable at least in view of their dependency from an allowable independent claim.

For completion, it is respectfully noted that the addition of Orimoto, which was cited in the rejection of Applicant's dependent claim 27, does not cure the shortcoming of Ishikawa and Inaba, and thus does not disclose or suggest Applicant's claimed subject matter.

All issues having been addressed, the subject application is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding objections and rejections. A Notice of Allowance is therefore earnestly solicited.

A call to the undersigned would be appreciated should the Examiner have any questions.

Respectfully submitted:

<u>Christine Wilkes Beninati</u>	<u>April 28, 2010</u>
Christine Wilkes Beninati	Date
Reg. No.: 37,967	

Customer No.: 29683
HARRINGTON & SMITH, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, LLC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
Telephone: (203) 925-9400
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245